REMARKS

Claims 11-20 are pending in the present application. Claim 11 had been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 11 may be found, for example, in the second paragraph of page 5 of the present application.

Claims 11-20 stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following comments.

Claims 11-13, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by European Patent EP0 507 743 82 (hereinafter referred to as "Edge"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to claim 11, the Office Action asserts that Edge discloses the elements of claim 11. The Applicant submits, however, that Edge does not teach or suggest all the features of the claim. First, Edge does not teach or suggest the use of separate search feature sets for each individual object. Rather, the search features of Edge are plain text translated from stenographic outlines generated by a stenographic shorthand machine. Thus, the search features of Edge only refer to one category (i.e., plain text), and no teaching or suggestion is given to utilize separate search feature sets for individual objects.

Additionally, the Office Action, in response to the Applicant's prior arguments filed February 10, 2003, asserts that Edge indeed teaches all of the claimed elements. However, the Office Action evinces a lack of appreciation of the specific teachings of Edge. Namely, the section referenced in the Office Action (i.e., page 2, ll. 28-39 of Edge) does not teach or suggest determining the search features from the image sequence (i.e., the actual audio/visual data). Rather, as argued previously, Edge does not teach or suggest determining search features from an image sequence. The Office Action argues in response to the Applicant's previous arguments that Edge discloses that words or phrases of an audio/visual segment are determined, converted to plain text and used as search features. However, the words and phrases that are determined by Edge are not determined from the image sequence, but from a transcription, such as a court transcription that may be performed simultaneously, but independently of the recording of the audio/visual information. Thus, it cannot be accurately argued that Edge teaches a step of determining the search features from the image sequence itself.

The Applicant again points to the specific teachings of Edge (page 3, ll. 26-30) describing the method flowchart of Figure 2. In this section of Edge, a synchronizing program 30 is described that causes the computer 14 to create a synchronized record including stenographic outlines generated by a stenographic shorthand machine 12. The stenographic outlines are not part of the audio/visual data made by the video recorder 20. Only these stenographic outlines are plain text translated, not the audio/visual data. Once the stenographic outlines are translated, they may be used along with pointers to provide a cross-reference to associated portions of the audio/visual data made by the video recorder 20. Accordingly, Edge does not teach or suggest the features alleged to be taught by Edge in the present Office Action.

Furthermore, Swanson et al. do not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Edge. Specifically, Swanson et al. refer to an image management system enabling the content-based retrieval of images. In particular, the image retrieval is based on properties of image regions and objects such as geometrical shapes, faces and so on (see col. 9, ll. 4-12). Thus, it is possible to use search features in order to retrieve individual objects. Nonetheless, Swanson et al. do not disclose dividing the search features into different categories (i.e., that each object may have individual search features taking into account the special property of the object) as featured in claim 11 wherein separate search feature sets are provided for each individual object.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record and requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 12-20, these claims are submitted to be allowable over the prior art of record based at least on their ultimate dependency on independent claim 11. In conclusion, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____
Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: July 15, 2003